



0 1620 0335 8395

Bopp

BEFORE

THE NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF THE NORMAN WELLS  
OIL PIPELINE APPLICATION

NEB ORDER OH-2-80

COMMITTEE FOR JUSTICE &amp; LIBERTY FOUNDATION

229 College Street

TORONTO, Ontario M5T 1R4

PREPARED EVIDENCE OF:

Most Rev. Remi J. De Roo, Bishop of VictoriaChairman of the Episcopal Commission for  
Social Affairs of the Canadian Conference  
of Catholic BishopsPOLAR  
PAM  
4395

POLARPAM

Aug 20 1982

No.:

Gift

M. Bopp

Pam:622.323:(\*472) NEB RDR





1. Q. What is your name and occupation?

A. Most Rev. Remi J. De Roo, Roman Catholic Bishop of Victoria. I am currently the Chairman of the Episcopal Commission for Social Affairs of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops.

2. Q. Whom do you represent?

A. I am here on behalf of the Social Affairs Commission of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (CCCCB). The CCCC is the national association of Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada. The Social Affairs Commission, which is composed of bishops from different regions of the country, is responsible for the national program of the Canadian bishops in promoting the social teachings of the Church. In particular, the Social Affairs Commission is responsible for matters pertaining to the bishops' program on the ethical issues of northern development.

In addressing issues of northern development, we do not pretend to be technical experts per se. Nor do we pretend to speak for all members of the Catholic Church. Our principal objective has been to identify and clarify some of the basic ethical issues involved in the debate over major resource development projects in the North. In order to clarify the ethical issues involved, the CCCC has taken a firm position with respect to specific struggles of northern native peoples and major resource development projects. In so doing, we have drawn upon the experience and expertise of our various ecumenical action/research projects related to these issues.

3. Q. What are some of the major ethical issues of northern development which have been identified by the bishops?

A. In September, 1975, the Canadian Catholic Bishops issued a major pastoral statement entitled, Northern Development: At What Cost? The statement was addressed to members of the Catholic Church, the Christian community at large, and the citizens of Canada. It focused attention on two sets of ethical issues involved in the future development of the





Canadian North, namely, social justice for the native peoples of the North and responsible stewardship of energy resources in Canada. The statement called for a public search for alternative approaches to northern development based upon the ethical principles of social justice and responsible stewardship.

In order to illustrate the kind of ethical issues at stake in the development of the Canadian North, the following passages may be helpful:

"... the Canadian North is fast becoming a centre stage in the continental struggle to gain control of new energy sources. The critical issue is how these northern energy resources are to be developed - by whom and for whom. We are especially concerned that the future of the North not be determined by colonial patterns of development, wherein a powerful few end up controlling both the people and the resources. (Article 11)

... some present examples of industrial planning give us cause for grave concern. For what we see emerging in the Canadian North are forms of exploitation which we often assume happen only in Third World countries. a serious abuse of both the Native Peoples and the energy resources of the North. Herein lies the Northern dilemma. What has been described as the "last frontier" in the building of this nation may become our own "Third World". (Article 12)

... we North Americans have created a highly industrialized society that places exorbitant demands on limited supplies of energy. The maximization of consumption, profit, power, has become the operating principle of this society. These are the driving forces behind the present continental struggle to gain control of northern energy resources. (Article 21)





... As a culture, we have not faced up to the fact that the world God created has its limits. Many voices now warn that mankind has reached a 'turning point' in history: crucial decisions must be made now to stop plundering the Earth's non-renewable resources before it is too late .... This is no longer simply a moral imperative. It has also become a practical necessity for the survival of our common humanity." (Article 22-3)

4. Q. What are some of the basic policy recommendations of the bishops with respect to northern development projects?

A. In our statement, Northern Development: At What Cost?, we formulated some general policy positions in relation to the emerging aspirations of northern native peoples. Asserting the principles of social justice and responsible stewardship, the bishops stressed that several conditions must be met before any final decisions are made to proceed with specific resource or industrial development projects in the North:

- a) sufficient public discussion and debate about proposed industrial projects, based on independent studies of energy needs and social costs of the proposed developments;
- b) achievement of a just land settlement with the Native Peoples, including hunting, fishing and trapping rights and fair royalties in return for the extraction of valuable resources from their land claims;
- c) effective participation by the Native Peoples in shaping the kind of regional development, beginning with effective control over their own future economic development;
- d) adequate measures to protect the terrain, vegetation, wildlife and waters of northern areas, based on complete and independent studies of the regional environment to be affected by proposed developments;





e) adequate controls to regulate the extraction of energy resources from the North, to prevent the rapid depletion of oil, gas, and other resources which are non-renewable. (Article 29, a-e)

5. Q. What specific initiatives or actions have the bishops taken in support of the Dene people in recent years?

A. It is difficult to provide a complete response to this question, but here is a partial list of public initiatives and actions.

- In September, 1975, the CCCB Social Affairs Commission decided, as a follow-up to the statement on Northern Development: At What Cost?, to focus attention on the situation of the Dene and the Mackenzie Valley pipeline as a national priority;

- In March 1976, the President of the CCCB along with other Church leaders met with the Federal Cabinet urging the government to introduce a moratorium on major northern development projects, like the Mackenzie Valley pipeline, until certain conditions were met;

- In May-June, 1976, bishops in many dioceses encouraged Catholic communities to participate in the southern hearings of the Berger Commission on the Mackenzie Valley pipeline;

- In June, 1976, the CCCB's Social Affairs Commission appeared before the Berger Inquiry with a statement of support for the Dene and the Inuit in their struggle to assert their rights to self-determination in the face of colonial models of development;

- In October, 1976, the Catholic and Anglican Churches provided emergency funds allowing the Dene to proceed with their important land claims assembly when the Federal government cut-off their funding;





- In April, 1977, representatives of the CCCB Social Affairs Department appeared before the National Energy Board, raising ethical issues about the control exercised by the petroleum industry over energy policies in Canada and the social costs of major projects like the Mackenzie Valley pipeline for southern Canadians as well as the Dene;
- In June, 1977, the President of the CCCB expressed strong support for the recommendations of the Berger Commission in a communiqué to the Prime Minister;
- In April, 1978, representatives of the CCCB Social Affairs Commission, along with other Church leaders, met with the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs in an effort to have Federal funding for the Dene claims restored.

In addition to these initiatives, we have been involved in meetings, with Dene leaders and in assemblies of the Dene. And, of course, we have strongly encouraged Project North in its working relationships with the Dene.

6. Q. What is your position with respect to the proposed Norman Wells pipeline?
- A. It is clear to us that the proposed Norman Wells pipeline poses yet another threat to the Dene Nation. Once again, the basic rights of the Dene people are being violated by corporations and governments who want to gain control of resources on their land. It is also clear that the proposed Norman Wells oil pipeline does not meet the conditions which the bishops outlined as being necessary before resource development projects proceed in the North. More specifically, our objections to the proposed Norman Wells pipeline may be briefly stated as follows:

First, and foremost, there has been no significant progress towards the settlement and implementation of the Dene claims in the Mackenzie





Valley. Following the Mackenzie Valley pipeline decision, the Federal government suspended claims negotiations with the Dene Nation, and funds required for land claims research were cut-off. More recently, partial funding was restored and negotiations are expected to resume again soon. In the meantime, however, valuable time and energies were lost. As the Berger Report concluded, the settlement and implementation of native claims is an essential pre-condition for any pipeline construction in the Mackenzie Valley.

Second, this pipeline should not be studied in isolation from industrial consequences. In other words, we are not dealing here simply with a single pipeline. Since the early seventies, the Federal government has been planning an energy corridor in the Mackenzie Valley. The proposed Norman Wells pipeline is likely to be the beginning of an energy and transportation corridor composed of pipelines, railroads, roads, and hydro-electric projects. The social and economic consequences of such a corridor would have a profound effect on the future of the Dene and other people in the North.

Third, from the evidence available so far, it appears that little or no serious attention has been given to the social and economic impact of the proposed Norman Wells pipeline. As presently designed, the pipeline project continues the boom and bust pattern of northern development, providing few if any economic benefits to the Dene. Thus, the project will serve to further lock the Dene into a state of economic dependency and underdevelopment. Furthermore, it appears that most of the social costs that accompany pipeline construction in the North -- social welfare costs, social inequalities, in-migration of workers, pressures on native women, alcoholism, health services -- will be largely borne by the local population.

In short, we support the Dene Nation in their position that the Norman Wells pipeline (or any other major resource project) should not be developed until the Dene have concluded a final settlement and



implementation of their outstanding claims with the Federal government. Moreover, we submit that the basic social and economic impact problems which the N.E.B. stated as reasons for rejecting the proposed Mackenzie Valley natural gas pipeline are equally valid today as they were three years ago.

7. Q. Are there any other observations which you would like to bring to the Board's attention at this time?

A. Yes. I believe there are some deep moral and ethical issues at stake in this controversy over this pipeline and related northern projects. The Berger Commission Report has shown us convincingly that if pipeline construction goes ahead in the Mackenzie Valley before there has been a just settlement and implementation of the native claims, the social, cultural, and economic consequences for the Native peoples could be devastating. In other words, the results may indeed be that of cultural genocide. We must ask ourselves: How far are we prepared to go? What human costs are at stake?

The proposed Norman Wells pipeline will add less than 1% to our national oil supply. Are we prepared to risk sacrificing the Dene people and their culture for the sake of adding 1% more oil to our national supply? If we are, then I suggest we are facing a profound moral crisis in this country. For the fact remains, there are alternative forms of energy investment open to us. It has been shown, for example, that effective conservation programs could save us more oil than the Norman Wells fields can produce at a cost less than what it would take to construct the refinery and pipeline.

Indeed, the time has come for some bold transformation in our energy system and northern development policies. As we concluded in our 1975 statement, Northern Development: At What Cost?

"In the final analysis, what is required is nothing less than fundamental social change. Until we as a society begin to change





lifestyles based on wealth and comfort, until we begin to change  
the profit-oriented priorities of our industrial system, we will  
continue placing exorbitant demands on limited supplies of energy  
in the North and end up exploiting the people of the North in order  
to get these resources." (Article 32)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

Date Due

|            |        |            |  |
|------------|--------|------------|--|
| JUN 26 '95 | RETURN | MAR 20 '00 |  |
| NOV 13 '97 |        |            |  |
| DEC 3 '97  |        |            |  |
|            |        |            |  |

49403

Pam:622.323:  
(\*472)

DE ROO, REMI J.

NEB  
RDR

AUTHOR  
Before the National Energy Board  
TITLE  
in the matter of the Norman Wells  
oil pipeline application NEB order  
OH-2-80





University of Alberta Library



0 1620 0335 8395